



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

[N.B.—The Greek word here translated priests is *πρεσβυτερος*, which properly signifies "elders."] The first thing to be determined in this passage is the true meaning to be attached to the words—"The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." If they stood alone, no person would hesitate to admit that they refer to a miraculous cure to be wrought upon the sick person spoken of in the previous verse. "The Lord," it is said, "shall raise him up." From what? Obviously from his bed of sickness. The word used by S. James (*ἐγερῆι*) is the same as that spoken by our Lord himself, when he effected the miraculous cure of the impotent man recorded in St. John's Gospel, ch. v. 8, and addressed him thus:—"Rise, take up thy bed and walk." So far, therefore, the object of the anointing spoken of by S. James is manifestly identical with that practised by the Apostles when they were first sent out by our Lord. S. Mark informs us, as we have already seen, that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." S. James (one of those same Apostles, be it remembered), in the passage just quoted, orders a sick man to send for the elders of the Church, who were to pray over him, and anoint him with oil: and he adds, that "the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." The object aimed at in both cases is clearly the same—namely, the recovery of the sick person, which was to be accomplished by the exertion of the miraculous powers then vouchsafed by the Lord to certain members of his Church, in accordance with his own parting words (S. Mark xvi. 17)—"These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." These miraculous gifts were not bestowed upon all Christians alike, nor could they be exerted upon all occasions. If an indiscriminate gift of healing all diseases were possessed by the Apostles and their cotemporaries, it is manifest that they might all have been alive to this day. There must have been some inward movement of the Spirit of God upon the mind, before any person could feel confident that a miracle could be wrought through his instrumentality; and this is the meaning of "the prayer of faith" spoken of by S. James, which one or more of the elders, moved by the Spirit of God, were to make for the recovery of the sick person, in full persuasion that the Lord, who gave the inward impulse to perform the miracle, would complete his own work, and restore the sick man to health.

The words of St. James, therefore, plainly refer to the miraculous cure of diseases, of which the anointing with oil was the outward sign. The same sign, as we have seen, was used by the Apostles generally for the same object; and even our Lord himself sometimes condescended to accompany a miraculous cure with some outward sign, as, for example, when he anointed the eyes of the blind man with clay—John xi. 6. But St. James goes on to add, "and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Now, we frequently read in Scripture that bodily diseases were inflicted by God as a punishment for some sin. Thus, in the Old Testament, King Uzziah was stricken with leprosy for offering sacrifice in the sanctuary, and Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, was smitten with the same disease for lying and covetousness. We read, too, in St. John's Gospel, that our Lord thus addressed the impotent man whom he had cured—"Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." And St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, who had profaned the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—"For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep."—1 Cor. xi. 32. In cases such as these, therefore, when the sickness was inflicted as a bodily chastisement for sin, the healing of the disease was a testimony that God forgave the sin. Thus, for example, when our Lord cured the man sick of the palsy (Matthew ix. 2, 6, 7), he addressed him thus—"Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee;" and, in this case, it deserves to be especially noted, that the miracles were wrought as a proof that the sins of the sick man were forgiven.—See verses 5, 6.

We have entered at some length into an explanation of this passage of St. James, because, when rightly understood, it affords no countenance whatever to the pretended sacrament of extreme unction. The anointing prescribed by St. James was to be administered to persons who were not to die, but to be raised up from sickness; it was primarily intended for the miraculous cure of diseases, and, therefore, was to last only so long as the Lord vouchsafed the gift of miracles to his Church; and the recovery of the sick man was to be the sure and certain token of the forgiveness of his sins promised by the Apostle. But that the anointing recommended by St. James cannot be the same as the extreme unction of the Roman Catholic Church, is evident from the following considerations:—St. James directs that the sick person should be anointed in reference to his cure; but the priest anoints him while in the agonies of death, when there is no prospect of recovery, and never administers this unction while there appears any hope of life. The Apostle orders this anointing for the cure of the body; but the Church of Rome applies it principally for the cure of the soul, concerning which

St. James gives no directions: for what is said of the forgiveness of sins is to be referred to faith and prayer, and not to the anointing. The anointing which St. James recommends was only applied in some cases, perhaps very few; but the Church of Rome uses it in all cases: therefore, St. James's unction, and the extreme unction of the Church of Rome, are two very different things.

Again, when we come to examine the effects which the great Roman Catholic divines ascribe to extreme unction, we find ourselves involved in the utmost confusion and perplexity. "It remits mortal sins," says Dens.* "It is not to be understood of mortal sins," says Faber.† "It remits venial sins," says the Catechism of the Council of Trent;‡ and it adds a reason, "for mortal sins are taken away by the sacrament of penance." "No," says Thomas Aquinas, "this is not true; it does not take away venial sins, but only the remains of sin."§ "Yes," says the Council of Trent, "it takes away both venial and mortal sins; for it wipes away all remains of sin."|| Thus nothing but perplexity seems to attend us in almost every step that we take in investigating the opinions of Roman Catholic divines regarding the effect of this rite. Where, we may well ask, is the great benefit Roman Catholics derive from their boasted possession of an infallible head, if it cannot enforce even the semblance of unity and consistency in the account which their divines give of what they refer to as one of the most important sacraments of their church?

We have seen that the words of the Apostle James related to the healing of the sick, or to their restoration to health, and that they furnish no authority for anointing the dying, solely with a view to their departure. There is reason to think that the practice of anointing the sick was superstitiously continued after the miraculous powers of healing had ceased; but of its being considered a sacrament, to be administered to the dying for their spiritual benefit, we read nothing for many centuries after Christ. There is no mention of it in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or in any of the writers of the first centuries, who wrote frequently and plainly of the discipline and sacraments of the Church. Four hundred revolving years ran their ample round, and left no trace of this sacrament. The ancient Fathers have treated freely of the two sacraments which have always been recognised in Christ's Church; baptism and the Lord's Supper meet the reader's eye in almost every page of their works. But extreme unction, wonderful to tell, is never mentioned. This ceremony which, in modern days, is said to remit sin, and strengthen the soul of the dying, and to be almost indispensable to salvation, is nowhere spoken of. This was a woeful and vexatious omission in the good Fathers, and has put modern Roman Catholic divines to a sad puzzle. Bellarmine and Archbishop M'Hale endeavour to excuse the ancients for omitting the history of this sacrament in their works, by alleging their want of occasion. The cardinal and archbishop for once are right. The early Christian authors had no opportunity for mentioning such a sacrament; for, in plain truth, such a sacrament did not then exist.

Pope Innocent the First, who flourished so late as the fifth century, is the earliest witness adduced on the Roman Catholic side of this question. Decentius, Bishop of Egrubium in Italy, had occasion to consult the pontiff on this subject, who returned the following answer:—"The diseased faithful may be anointed with consecrated oil of chrism. This ointment may be used, not only by priests, but by all Christians, who may anoint not only themselves, but also their friends. But the chrism may not be poured on penitents, for it is a kind of sacrament."¶

We request the reader's particular attention to this reply. Pope Innocent says that *not only priests, but all Christians may anoint themselves as well as their friends*. The Church of Rome now says, that extreme unction can only be administered by a priest, and anathematizes all who believe otherwise. Pope Innocent calls this rite "a kind of sacrament." The Council of Trent denounced a terrible anathema against any person who should presume to deny that extreme unction was a true and proper sacrament instituted by Christ. Surely, we have here abundant proof that the Roman Catholic Church now holds a doctrine altogether different from that which it held in the time of Pope Innocent the First, and that, therefore, it cannot be the immutable, infallible church which it professes to be.

There are various other interesting points on this subject, to which we cannot now advert, but to which, on some future occasion, we may, perhaps, invite the attention of our readers.

* Peccata mortalia remittit.—Dens. 7, 18.

† Non intelligitur de peccato mortali.—Faber ii., 259.

‡ Peccata venialia remittit.—Cat. Trid. 195.

§ Aquinas iii. 565. Faber ii. 259.

¶ Cuius unctio delicta, si qua sint adhuc explande, ac peccati reliquias abstergit.—Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv., cap. 2.

¶ Innoc. Ep. i. n. 8.—"Sancto oleo chrismatis non solum sacerdotibus, sed omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut suorum necessitate inungendo. Penitentibus autem istud infundi non potest, quia genus est sacramenti."

TALK OF THE ROAD—No. VI.

So Pat and Jem went straight to Mr. Owens' house, and he brought them into his study.

"Well, boys," said Mr. Owens, "did you read anything of the books, and how do you like them?"

"We like them well, your reverence," said Jem, "for they teach us more about God than ever we knew before, and they teach things that ought to make us love him if we have any heart to him at all."

"And do you find much difference in the books?" said Mr. Owens, turning to Pat.

"Nothing to speak of, for so far, your reverence," said Pat; "there's words here and there not just the same; but for the meaning, there's no differ to signify, that I see yet."

"There are some differences, though," said Mr. Owens, "that will surprise you very much when you come to them, for some of them are just the very contrary of the difference you might expect to find in the two books. But I will tell you about that some other time, for I would rather hear you speak now, if you have anything to ask me about what you find in the books."

"That's just it, your reverence," said Jem; "we want to ask you about the right way of praying to God; for sure when we see what he says to them that pray to him, it's a poor thing not to know the right way."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "it's a good thing when reading the Bible makes us ask questions like that; but if you could explain your difficulty a little more, I might know better how to help you."

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "we want to know if the likes of us, poor creatures, may just go straight to God, and pray to him ourselves, without anybody to speak to him for us, or if we must get somebody to speak for us, and offer our prayers to him—somebody that he will be more willing to listen to than to ourselves."

"That's a very important question," said Mr. Owens, "and the answer 's very plain; we are sinful and fallen creatures, not fit in ourselves to speak to a God who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity; and, therefore, we have no reason to hope that our prayers will come up to him at all, unless somebody that a holy God can listen to should offer up our prayers to him, and intercede with him to accept our prayers."

"Why, your reverence," said Jem, "sure the Protestants don't believe that!"

"A man who does not believe that," said Mr. Owens, "cannot be a Christian, and so we need not talk about his being a Protestant. But we do believe it, and it lies at the root of our religion, and all our prayers to God are founded on it."

"And so," said Pat, "your reverence thinks it good to get the Blessed Virgin, and the angels, and the saints, to speak for us to God, and get him to hear our prayers?"

"No," said Mr. Owens, "I did not say that we were to get them to speak for us; we should be sure to get some one that we know can hear us, and that we know God will hear."

"And who will we get, your reverence," said Pat, "if we don't get them to speak for us?"

"Maybe your reverence means," said Jem, "the verse that we read here in the two books, the last night we were here."

"That's just what I mean," said Mr. Owens; "and now, do you remember what it was?"

"I do, your reverence," said Jem; "it was just this—'There is one God, and one mediator of God and man—the man Christ Jesus.'"

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "we think that if we go to God without that mediator, that we have no right to believe that God will accept our prayers; but if we have that mediator to intercede for us, and offer up our prayers to God, and ask him to receive them, then our prayers will be accepted by God; and before we go any farther," said Mr. Owens, "let me show you, out of the Douay Bible, why we think so." So Mr. Owens turned to the following passages and read them—"I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me."—John xiv. 6. "Amen, amen, I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in my name, he will give it you."—John xvi. 23. "Jesus is entered into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us."—Hebrews ix. 24. "He is able also to save for ever them that come to God by him; always living to make intercession for us."—Heb. vii. 25. "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."—Luke xxii. 32. "And not for them (the Apostles) only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me."—John xvii. 20. "So here you see," said Mr. Owens, "if we want to come to God in prayer, we must come through Christ, who is the way; and we must pray in the name of Christ if we want our prayers to be granted; and then Christ makes intercession for us, that our prayers may be heard, and he prays for all who believe in his Word. So you see," said Mr. Owens, "we do not want for somebody to pray for us, and to intercede with God to hear our prayers; we have one who is able and willing to do it; and if we want our prayers to be heard

we must offer them up through his intercession—that is, we must ask him to speak for us, and to offer our prayers to God,”

“And may we ask the saints and angels to do it at all, your reverence?” said Pat.

“That’s a thing that God must know better than we can,” said Mr. Owens. “I have showed you, out of the Douay Bible, that we have great promises to those who pray through Jesus Christ, and ask him to intercede for them. But did you find, in the Douay Bible, any promise to those that pray through the Virgin Mary or the saints?”

“Your reverence,” said Jem, “that’s the very thing we want to ask you; neither of us has found the like of that in the Bible, but we haven’t read all the Bible, and it will take us long to do it, and maybe it is in that part that we haven’t read; and we just want to know if there is anything in it at all about asking the Blessed Virgin and the saints to pray for us.”

“Well,” said Mr. Owens, “I think it would be better you would ask some one else that question; for if I say there is no such thing in the Bible, you will think, maybe, that it is because I am a Protestant that I say so, or because I do not understand the right sense of it; and so, perhaps, you would not believe me.”

“And who will we ask, your reverence?” said Pat.

“Of course, you will ask Father John,” said Mr. Owens; “if he can show it to you in the Bible, of course he will; and if he cannot show it to you in the Bible, then you will be sure that it is not there; and maybe you would not be sure merely for my telling you.”

“Well, your reverence,” said Jem, “that would be the right way; only I doubt it would not do at all.”

“And why not?” said Mr. Owens. “Sure your clergy ought to be ready to tell you whether the things they teach you are in the Bible or not.”

“They ought, your reverence,” said Jem; “sure enough, that is true; but, then, that is just the thing we durstn’t ask them at all.”

“And why not?” said Mr. Owens.

“Why, your reverence,” said Jem, “if it was in the Bible, that would be all right; and I’m thinking Father John would be ready enough to tell us if it was in it; but if it’s not in it, your reverence, wouldn’t I be in the queer way to be asking Father John to tell me out of the Bible what’s not in the Bible at all? Isn’t that what would anger him? And how do I know but what he might curse me from the altar, and leave me without a bit to put in the children’s mouths? So I would rather take your reverence’s word for it. Is there anything in the Bible for asking the saints and angels to bring our prayers to God for us?”

“Well,” said Mr. Owens, “in that case I must answer you. There is not one word in the Bible, from beginning to end, to tell us to ask either saints, or angels, or the Blessed Virgin, to pray for us; but a great deal to tell us that we want nobody but Jesus Christ to offer our prayers to God. Just listen to this,” said Mr. Owens, “‘Having therefore a great High Priest, who hath passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God,’ . . . ‘Let us go, therefore, WITH CONFIDENCE to the throne of grace; that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid.’ Here you see,” said Mr. Owens, “our having such a High Priest is sufficient to warrant us to pray with confidence for the mercy and grace we want; and if that is enough to make us pray with confidence, what room is there for anything more? And more than that,” said Mr. Owens, “I can tell you, that the Roman Catholic books, that argue for asking the saints to pray for us, do never give any proof for it out of the Bible; and, of course, if they could give proof out of the Bible they would.”

“And what proof do they give for it, your reverence?” said Jem.

“The proof they give is this,” said Mr. Owens: “they say that the Bible tells us to pray for each other, and to ask each other to pray for us. And so far they are right, for the Bible does teach us to do that; and then they say, would it not be better still to ask the angels and the saints in heaven to pray for us? But that is an invention of their own; for the Bible does not say that.”

“Well, your reverence,” said Pat, “I would like to hear more about that; sure there’s my brother, that went to Australia, if he was here now, I would rather ask him to pray for me than anybody at all; he was the good brother, and he used to read the Bible betimes, afore any of the other boys thought of reading it; and though he was not so attentive to his duties as some of them, he was the best Christian at all; and sure I would be glad I could only ask him to pray for me; and if he was in heaven, wouldn’t he care for me still? and wouldn’t his prayers be better still?”

“Well,” said Mr. Owens, “I hope our friends in heaven doremember us, as we ought to remember them; and it may be that they still pray to God for us; but we can say nothing at all about that, because God had not told us anything about it; and no one else could tell us anything about it. But I do not see how you, as a Christian, could ask your brother, in heaven, to pray for you, the same as you would if he was standing beside you.”

“Well, if your reverence could show me the differ,” said Pat.

“Where is he now?” said Mr. Owens.

“In Australia, your reverence,” said Pat.

“That is just at the other side of the world,” said Mr. Owens; “if you could make a hole straight down into the ground, and dig it about eight thousand miles deep, it might come out at the other side, near about where he is; it is a long way,” said Mr. Owens.

“It is, your reverence,” said Pat.

“And you would like to ask him to pray for you?” said Mr. Owens.

“I would, your reverence,” said Pat.

“Well, then,” said Mr. Owens, “just go down on your knees here, this moment, and call on him to pray for you.”

“Oh, your reverence,” said Pat, “sure I couldn’t do that.”

“And why can you not do that?” said Mr. Owens.

“Because, your reverence, he can’t hear me,” said Pat.

“Would it not be a great sin, to do it?” said Mr. Owens.

“It would, your reverence, not a doubt of it,” said Pat; “and I durstn’t do it at all.”

“But you would ask your brother to pray for you, if he was standing here beside you?” said Mr. Owens.

“I would, surely, your reverence,” said Pat.

“But it is quite a different thing to call on him to pray for you while he is in Australia?” said Mr. Owens.

“It isn’t like it at all, your reverence,” said Pat.

“And if you got a letter to-morrow,” said Mr. Owens, “to say your brother was dead, would that be the same as if he was standing here beside you?”

“No, indeed, your reverence,” said Pat; “nothing like it.”

“And if you then went down on your knees,” said Mr. Owens, “and called on him to pray for you, which would that be most like—asking his prayers while he was standing beside you, or calling on him while he was in Australia?”

“It would be a deal more like asking while he was in Australia,” said Pat.

“Well,” said Mr. Owens, “the only reason the Roman Catholics can give for praying to the saints in heaven to pray for us is this, that it is just the same as asking our friends beside us to pray for us. Now, you see it is not the same, but quite different: it is just like praying to our friends on earth in a way that no Christian durst do, for fear of making God angry with us. Tell me now,” said Mr. Owens, “would you go down on your knees and call on the present Pope, Pius the Ninth, who is at Rome, 1,000 miles off, to pray for you?”

“No, your reverence,” said Pat; “no Catholic would do that.”

“Would it not be very wicked and sinful if they did?” said Mr. Owens.

“It would, your reverence,” said Pat.

“Would it not be putting the Pope in the place of God, to suppose he could hear what you said?” said Mr. Owens.

“Well, I think it would be very like it,” said Pat.

“If you spoke ever so loud, the Pope could not hear you,” said Mr. Owens.

“He could not, your reverence,” said Pat.

“And if he knew of your prayer at all,” said Mr. Owens, “it could only be because he knew the thoughts of your heart.”

“Nothing else, your reverence,” said Pat.

“Can you speak loud enough to be heard in heaven?” said Mr. Owens.

“I cannot, your reverence,” said Pat.

“Well, then,” said Mr. Owens, “if the saints hear your prayers, it can only be because they know the thoughts of your heart; and is that not putting them in the place of God, for Solomon says to God—‘Thou only knowest the hearts of all the children of men?’” and here Mr. Owens showed them the words in the Douay Bible—3 Kings, ch. viii., verse 39.

“And is there nothing in the Bible, your reverence,” said Pat, “for praying to the saints or angels?”

“Nothing at all,” said Mr. Owens; “and if there was, you may be sure Father John would show you that much of it; but he would not like you come upon these words of Jesus Christ—‘The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve.’—Matthew iv. 10.”

“Well, your reverence,” said Jem, “now it comes to my mind that I learned a catechism at the big school I learned to read in, that was kept by the monks, or the Christian Brethren, as they call them; and in that catechism, it was took out of the Bible that St. John, the Blessed Apostle, did worship an angel; and sure St. John would not do it if it was wrong; but I disremember what part of the Bible they took it out of.”

“I will show you the catechism and the place in the Bible too,” said Mr. Owens. So he took down off the shelf a little book, called “AN ABRIDGMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, with proofs of Scripture, on points controverted, by way of question and answer. Composed in 1649, by H. T. of the English College at Douay. Now revised by the RIGHT REV. JAMES

DOYLE, D.D., and prescribed by him to be used in the united Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin. Dublin: Printed by Richard Coyne, 4, Capel-street, printer, bookseller, and publisher to the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth, 1846.” So Mr. Owens read out of the title page. “Is this the book?” said Mr. Owens.

“It is, your reverence,” said Jem; “and is that the Doctor Doyle that was Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare?”

“The very man,” said Mr. Owens, “and he was the most learned and clever man that has been a Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland for many years; and you see he revised this book himself, and ordered it to be used in his diocese; and that is the way you came to learn it. And now let us look for the Scripture proof for praying to angels, and you may be sure this book will give the best proof that can be got in the Bible.” So Mr. Owens turned to page 52, where it speaks of the lawfulness of worshipping saints and angels. “Question—How prove you that?” “Answer—First, out of Joshua, ch. v., verses 14 and 15, where Joshua did it—‘I am Prince of the Host of the Lord, SAID THE ANGEL to Joshua, and Joshua fell flat on the ground, and adoring said, what saith my Lord to his servant?’” And here Mr. Owens bid them observe the words—“SAID the angel to Joshua;” and then he turned to the place in the Douay Bible, and showed them that this person who spoke to Joshua is not called an angel at all, but in the second verse of the next chapter, he is called THE LORD; so it was the Lord, and not an angel, that Joshua worshipped. And then Mr. Owens read the rest of the same answer in Dr. Doyle’s Catechism.

“Secondly, Apocalypse, chapter xxii., v. 8, where St. John did it (though the angel had once before willed him not to do it, in regard of his apostolical dignity, chap. 19, v. 10), and I fell down, saith he, to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things.” And then Mr. Owens stopped; and Jem waited for a minute; and then he said—“And did the Blessed Apostle fall down to worship the angel?”

“He surely did,” said Mr. Owens.

“And what does your reverence say to that?” said Pat; “does not that make it out to be right to worship the angel?”

So Mr. Owens said nothing at all; but he took the Douay Bible, and opened it at the place that the catechism refers to (Apocalypse, or Revelation, xxii. 8), and bid Pat read it; and so Pat read—“And I John, who have heard and seen these things. And after I had heard and seen, I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things.”

“Well, your reverence,” said Pat, “is not that the very thing that is in the catechism?” and Pat looked as if he thought, now, that Mr. Owens was only imposing on them, when he told them there was nothing in the Bible for worshipping angels, and that maybe the priests had the Bible on their side after all.

“And what do you say?” said Mr. Owens, turning to Jem.

“What can I say,” said Jem, “when St. John worshipped the angel.”

“Read the next verse,” said Mr. Owens to Pat.

So Pat read—“And he said unto me, SEE THOU DO IT NOT, for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the words of the prophecy of this book. ADORE GOD.”

“You see now,” said Mr. Owens, “when St. John went to worship the angel, the angel warned him not to do such a thing, and told him to worship God.”

“Well,” said Jem, “if that does not beat all! Now I know what I wanted.”

“What is that?” said Mr. Owens.

“That there is nothing in the Bible for worshipping angels,” said Jem; “for sure if there was any proof at all of it there, they would not have to go in such a barefaced like way to take a proof out of the very place that bids us not to do it.”

“That is enough for me, too,” says Pat; “its surely not in the Bible.”

“One word more,” said Mr. Owens. “You see in the note in the Douay Bible, on chap. 19, v. 10, it says, that maybe the angel only said it out of modesty, on account of the dignity of St. John as Apostle. That may lead you to think that though the angel was ashamed to let an apostle worship him, yet he would have let you or me adore him easy enough. So now, Pat, look back to the last verse you read, and see why the angel would not let St. John worship him.”

“Because he was his fellow-servant, your reverence,” said Pat.

“And is the angel fellow-servant to any one else?” said Mr. Owens.

“To all them that keep the words of the prophecy of this book,” said Pat.

“Well,” said Mr. Owens, “you see that if we keep the words of this prophecy, we, too, are forbidden to worship the angel, by the very same reason. And mark this too,” said Mr. Owens; “the question in Dr. Doyle’s catechism is about worshipping saints as well as angels; but the answer offers no proof for praying to saints, not even so bad a one as it gives for angels: so you may well think there is nothing in the Bible for worshipping saints.”

"Well, your reverence," said Pat, "we have got what we wanted this night, anyway."

And so they were going away, but Jem stopped; "your reverence," said he, "if the blessed Apostle was going to do what was wrong, why was that put in the Bible?"

"To show us," said Mr. Owens, "how great the temptation is to worship other beings besides God; and to show us what need all men have to watch against a sin that even an apostle might fall into, if he was not warned; and to show us, too, that we might not follow even an apostle against the words of Christ—'The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve.'"

"I see now, your reverence," said Jem; "and I see it's no use to pray to angels, when the angel knows his duty better than to take our prayers. Sure enough we must worship God only."

"And remember, too," said Mr. Owens, "that if we want to be heard, we are to pray in the name of Jesus Christ, and trusting to him as our mediator, and then we have his promise to hear us."

SHALL ROME HAVE THE EXCLUSIVE CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

In a former number of this publication, we put to Roman Catholic laymen the important question, whether it was for the advantage of this country, morally and politically, that the Romish priesthood should obtain the exclusive control over the education of the laity. We endeavoured to point out to them that the answer to that question should be determined by the actual results which had followed from their success in securing this great object of their policy in other countries; and we cited the example of Italy to show that there, at least, degradation, moral and political, had resulted from their success. The argument, however, which we then urged, must, to a great degree, depend, not on the example of one nation or one country, but on the uniformity of results that have flowed from the same causes; and the country to which we would next call our readers' attention is Spain.

Among all the great nations of Europe, there is not one in which the domination and control of the Romish priesthood has been carried to such an height of power and exclusiveness as in Spain. The birthplace of Dominick and Ignatius Loyola, of Francis Xavier and of Alphonsus Liguori, the four most memorable saints canonized by Rome in modern times, her rulers, influenced by their spirit, were ever ready to compel submission to Rome by the power of the sword. From her ports issued forth the invincible Armada that was to destroy heresy in England, and her armies were arrayed by the side of the forces of the League, to crush the Huguenots in France. For the education and instruction of the Spanish people in the dogmas of Rome, an ecclesiastical establishment had been created and endowed, which numbered in its ranks at least one-thirtieth of the whole population of the country; and the teaching and control of this vast army of ecclesiastics was enforced by the dungeons and autos *da fe* of the terrible Inquisition. No book unsanctioned by that tribunal could circulate in Spain; and so jealous was it of the slightest contamination of heresy, that even the epithet of "learned," applied to a heretic author by the most orthodox of their own writers, was rigorously expunged, lest it should be supposed that any heretic was rightly called so. In Spain then, at least, the Roman Catholic Church had full and complete sway over the national mind; and if her teaching does, indeed, produce as its fruit that righteousness which the inspired wisdom of Solomon tells us exalteth a nation, what country in Europe—what nation in the world—should have attained the same height of moral and political grandeur, and retained it, as long as the Spanish monarchy?

In contrasting the past and present condition of the Spanish monarchy, we will avail ourselves of the eloquent description given by Mr. Macaulay, in one of his brilliant essays. After describing the vast extent and power of the Spanish empire in the sixteenth century, when the Spanish monarch ruled over the whole Peninsula, over Naples and Sicily, over Holland, Flanders, and Franche Comte, and when a boundless empire in America poured its treasures into her bosom, and every neighbouring nation trembled for its independence, he thus proceeds:—"The ascendancy which Spain then had in Europe was, in one sense, well deserved. It was an ascendancy which had been gained by unquestioned superiority in all the arts of policy and war. In the sixteenth century, Italy was not more decidedly the land of the fine arts. Germany was not more decidedly the land of bold theological speculation, than Spain was the land of statesmen and of soldiers. The character which Virgil has ascribed to his countrymen, might have been claimed by the grave and haughty chiefs who surrounded the throne of Ferdinand the Catholic, and of his immediate successors. That majestic air 'regere imperio populos,' was not better understood by the Romans, in the proudest days of their republic, than by Gonsalvo and Ximenes, Cortes and Alva. The skill of the Spanish diplomatists was renowned throughout

Europe. The sovereign nation was unrivalled both in regular and irregular warfare. The impetuous chivalry of France, the serried phalanx of Switzerland, were alike found wanting when brought face to face with the Spanish infantry. In the wars of the New World, where something different than ordinary strategy was required in the general, and something different from ordinary discipline in the soldiers—when it was every day necessary to meet, by some new expedient, the varying tactics of a barbarous enemy, the Spanish adventurers, sprung from the common people, displayed a fertility of resource, and a talent for negotiation and command, to which history scarcely affords a parallel."

Such was the eminence attained in the arts of war and government by the Spaniards of that age; nor were they wanting in the liberal arts and sciences. Prescott, in his history of that period, observes:—

"The Castilian scholars of that age may take rank with their illustrious contemporaries of Italy. They could not, indeed, achieve such brilliant results in the discovery of the remains of antiquity, for such remains had been long scattered and lost amid the centuries of exile and disastrous warfare consequent on the Saracen invasion. But they were unwearied in their illustrations, both oral and written, of the ancient authors; and their numerous annotations, translations, dictionaries, grammars, and various works of criticism, many of which, though now obsolete, passed into repeated editions in their own days, bear ample testimony to the generous zeal with which they conspired to raise their contemporaries to a proper level for contemplating the works of the great masters of antiquity, and well entitled them to the high eulogium of Erasmus, that 'liberal studies were brought, in the course of a few years, in Spain, to so flourishing a condition, as might not only excite the admiration, but serve as a model to the most celebrated nations of Europe.' The Spanish universities were the theatre on which this classical erudition was more especially displayed. Academies of repute were to be found in Seville, Toledo, Salamanca, and Alcalá, and learned teachers were drawn from abroad by the most liberal emoluments. At the head of those establishments stood the illustrious city of Salamanca. Such was its repute, that foreigners as well as natives were attracted to its schools, and at one time 7,000 students were assembled within its walls. Nor was this devotion to literature confined to the pursuits of classical literature; the same historian adds:—"A similar impulse was felt in the other walks of knowledge. Jurisprudence assumed a new aspect under the learned labours of Montalvo. The mathematics formed a principal branch of education, and were successfully applied to astronomy and geography. Valuable treatises were produced on medicine, and on the more familiar practical arts, as husbandry, for example. History, which since the time of Alphonso X., had been held in higher honour and more widely cultivated in Castile than in any other European state, began to lay aside the garb of chronicle, and to be studied on more scientific principles." Nor did this literary ardour and progress fail in producing the more permanent works of genius. Soon appeared that wonderful work of genius that has made the name of Cervantes and the achievements of Don Quixote familiar to every nation in Europe. Then, too, Calderon almost rivalled in fertility of intellect our own immortal Shakspeare. To these might be added a host of other names which rendered the Spanish literature of that day a worthy rival of that contemporaneous literature of England, which boasted the great names of Shakspeare and Spenser, of Bacon and Raleigh. But while the English literature of the Elizabethan era was but the glorious dawn of that bright day of literature and science of which we have not yet seen the close, the Spanish literature of the same period was only a meteor light, which shot up brightly, indeed, at first, but, having long since passed away, has only made the succeeding darkness more gloomy and intense. For two centuries Spain has not produced a single name eminent in literature or science. Alone, of all the nations composing the great European confederacy, Spain has sent no contribution to the numerous and various discoveries of modern times. The names of Newton, Laplace, Leibnitz, Tycho Brache, Kepler, and Gassendi, show that science has had its votaries in every part of Europe, except the Spanish peninsula. To the Spanish mind the discoveries of Newton brought no light; for they were the discoveries of an heretic, and therefore could not enlighten an orthodox son of the Roman Church. Those universities which the piety and liberality of Isabella founded or enlarged, have all disappeared, save Salamanca; and that celebrated seat of learning, like Spain herself, exhibits only the melancholy decay which has come over all Spanish greatness. A modern traveller, speaking of it, says—"The days of its collegiate glory are long since past by, never to return. Its walls are now silent, and grass is growing in its courts, which were once daily thronged by at least 8,000 students—a number to which, at the present day, the population does not amount."

Nor has it been only on the literature of Spain that blight and decay have fallen. Where is now the mighty empire, on whose vast possessions the sun never set, and

at whose greatness the other nations trembled? The sixteenth century saw Holland revolted and independent. The middle of the seventeenth century saw Portugal assert its independence; whilst Flanders and Franche Comte were wrested from the Spanish crown, to increase the strength of France. The close of the same century saw the whole of the Spanish monarchy pass under the dominion of the grandson of Louis XIV.; and, for the next century, Spain was but an humble satellite, following, in peace and war, the politics of the French court. One-half of the nineteenth century has now passed. It has seen Spain rescued from French invasion by the bayonets of an heretic army. It has seen almost the whole of the vast empire in America throw off their allegiance to the mother country, and establish independent republics. Whilst Spain itself, for the last twenty years, has been the prey of anarchy and civil war, to be succeeded only by the domination of a successful military adventurer. No wonder, then, that all modern travellers unite in mourning over the sad lot of Spain. Struck, as they all are, with the wonderful advantages of a country intersected by great rivers, defended by noble mountains, rich with the most productive mines; having ports looking on every sea, and blessed with a climate fitted for every production—advantages which had made it, when under the dominion of the Romans and the Moors, a garden of plenty and delight—when they see the picture of neglect and desolation, moral and physical, which the greater part of the Peninsula presents, the face of nature and the mind of man dwarfed and curtailed of their fair proportions; their inherent fertility allowed to run into vice and luxuriant weeds; the energies of her people misdirected; their capabilities for all good converted into elements powerful only for evil—no wonder they should mourn and lament over the change that has come over the fair vision, and abhor and denounce the blighting superstition which, for centuries, has placed the ban of its curse on all knowledge and all learning which did not pander to its own exclusiveness. Yes, to preserve to Spain an exclusively Roman Catholic population, to have none but Roman Catholic judges, and a Roman Catholic army; to permit access to no literature except Roman Catholic literature, was the grand object of political wisdom in Spain. Philip II. declared that he would rather lose all his dominions than be the sovereign of a single heretic. For this the Jews were banished, the Moors were expelled, and the Protestant heretics of Holland driven into a successful rebellion. In truth, Spain affords the most striking example of the effects which this system will produce, when it is pursued consistently through all its practical consequences to inquisitions and acts of faith. The progress of all nations necessarily depends upon activity of mind, and upon the advancement of knowledge. The arts of navigation and war, the results of the most profound and sublime researches of science, can never long flourish when knowledge is not ardently and boldly cultivated by many minds. A priesthood who claim exclusive control over the education of the laity, soon usurp a jurisdiction over sciences the most remote from their own peculiar province, and forbid their cultivation.

It is no wonder that no mathematician should have arisen in Spain, after the fate which Galileo experienced from the Inquisition in Italy. Spain had not, and still wants engineers, because she had no mathematician; and she had no mathematician because she had an Inquisition. She could not profit by the discoveries of foreign nations in the arts and sciences, because the Inquisition and Index Expurgatorius excluded all literature that did not recognise the infallible right of Rome and her priests to dogmatize on all branches of human learning and knowledge.

The void created by the expulsion of the Jews and the Moriscos might have been supplied by the natural progress of population; but what could revive the spirit, the curiosity, the sense of security, the ardour of mental enterprise, which had been extinguished by the example of their expulsion? To give the Church of Spain and its priests entire and complete control, the mind of the people was emasculated; and the government, which at their instance, made the exercise of the understanding penal, soon found itself without statesmen, without officers, and without seamen, and fell into that state of wretched debility which is but a just retribution for its cowardly intolerance.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF SIGNOR AMEDEO BERT, VAUDOIS PASTOR OF TURIN.

[Translated from the original Italian.]

He was summoned by the editor of a paper called the *Ultramontano* (which is considered to be the organ of the Jesuits), on account of an article he had written in another paper, answering a calumnious attack upon the Protestant faith.

On Saturday (10th July, 1852), I was conducted to the Audience-hall of the tribunal, and made to seat myself on a bench which had been occupied a few minutes before by five or six felons, who had received condemnation, and were led away by the carbiniers as I entered. I remained for five hours upon this seat of the guilty.

My article was immediately read aloud, in which, after giving a sketch of the Lutheran reformation, I said—